STAT

DCI/RM 3410-79

PAO

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON 20330

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

10 October 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY TO THE DCI FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: PRC(S)

Following the PRC(S) on October 4, 1979, the attached memo was sent by W. B. Cutter, calling for a joint hearing on budgeting and management issues involved for the METSAT follow-on, NOSS, and other related programs. This meeting is now scheduled for Friday, October 12. Questions and issues to be addressed at the hearing were also sent and are attached.

I attended a strategy session at NASA on October 10 to prepare for the Friday hearing. Several approaches were tentatively agreed upon and position papers are currently being developed. We will keep you informed.

[redacted] 25X1 NRO

Charles W. Cook
Deputy Under Secretary
(Space Systems)

Attachment
OMB Ltr to SECDEF,
28 Sep 79

CONFIDENTIAL

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

SEP 28 1979

Honorable Harold Brown
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As you know, the Administration has been reviewing the potential for further convergence of civil and military polar meteorological satellite (MetSat) programs. The policy aspects of this issue will be discussed in the scheduled meeting of the Policy Review Committee (Space). In the meantime, to assist in the FY 1981 budget decisions, OMB needs agency estimates for the major MetSat program alternatives.

We request that DOC, DOD, and NASA present the most definitive available estimates of costs, benefits, and time phasing for (1) a single system of three advanced satellites and (2) the continued procurement of current spacecraft (modified only for shuttle launch) for separate but better coordinated programs. Please include the related implications for the cost of ocean remote sensing programs. A key constraint is that any request for funding development of advanced meteorological satellites should be on the basis of a single three satellite system to meet both civil and military requirements.

We have scheduled a joint hearing from 2-5 p.m. on Wednesday, October 10, 1979, in Room 10103 of the NEOB to review with your representatives the information requested above and to discuss the budgetary and management issues involved for the MetSat follow-on, NOSS, and other related programs.

Should you have any questions, please contact Dan Taft at 395-3285.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

25X1
NRO

W. Bowman Cutter
Executive Associate Director
for Budget

IDENTICAL LETTERS SENT TO SECRETARY KREPS AND DR. FROSCH

1. Provide annual Defense expenditures for the polar orbiting meteorological satellite system, i.e., research, development, design, acquisition and operational costs. Include manpower numbers as well. Provide annual Commerce expenditures for the polar orbiting meteorological satellite system, i.e., research, development, design, acquisition, and operational costs. Include manpower numbers and identify NASA expenditures. (U)

2. In a four constellation satellite approach discuss and compare the requirements for the 6:30 and 7:30 nodal crossing times. (U)

3. Account for and identify the requirements that are driving the need to upgrade system satellite at Defense. Specifically list and prioritize these requirements. Is the national intelligence requirement a driving force for an improved satellite system. Indicate how these needs are being met now and state how they would be met in the future without an advance satellite system. How would the Navy, Air Force and Army, as primary users, share the costs for new data? Does Commerce need a technically upgraded system. (C)

4. Account for the proposed expenditures in the Defense meterological satellite upgrade that are directed toward oceanographic requirements. How would these needs be met without a technical upgrade; would Defense support NOSS to meet their needs for oceanographic data or design a completely new system? (U)

5. Provide cost estimates over the next decade (both the space and ground segment), as outlined in question 1 for coordinated-dual programs; for joint managed programs, for Defense managed and for Commerce managed programs. Provide data for both a four constellation and a three constellation system with and without technology upgrade. (U)

6. Provide cost benefit/analysis of Commerce and Defense using exactly the same spacecraft. (U)

CONFIDENTIAL

1. For both options (i.e., a single system of three advanced satellites; separate systems of four current spacecraft) provide a breakout of the costs (1980-1985) by program segments (e.g., s/c development, procurement, sensor development, launch, command and control) for each agency in 1981 dollars and adjusted for inflation using NASA factors. Identify key assumptions (e.g., number of birds carried on shuttle, number of satellites, launching schedule) and relate development/procurement schedule to operational needs and where estimates are soft give reasons. Make sure that costs of ongoing system can be separated from follow-on system.

2. What savings are identified for the four current satellite systems through better coordination between DOC and DOD? Be as specific as possible.

3. Discuss the cost-sharing arguments and management options for a single 3 satellite system to meet both civil and military requirements.

4. What data requirements need to be met for DOD and DOC? What requirements are driving DOD's possible need for advanced spacecraft? What sensor payloads are proposed for each satellite. Extra capacity? Priority of sensors? New capabilities/benefits?

5. What would be the programmatic deficiencies for NOAA/DOC if TIROS-N or Block 5 continued?

6. Please describe the results to date of the Block 6 studies by five contractors.

7. Please describe the present status of System 85 studies.

NOSS

1. Review the possible options for obtaining oceanic data from satellites, including flying some sensors on Met Sats. What would be the effect of such options on costs and benefits, including size of satellite and Met Sat system costs? Comment on the IRS^3 Phase 1 study in this respect.

2. Could system 85 carry ocean sensing other than the CZCS. Why? Why not?

3. What ocean sensors could be added to Bloc 6 at same time.

4. Please prioritize the value of the data--both for DOD and DOC points of view--obtained by the ocean sensors proposed for NOSS.

5. Please discuss what data is lost by operating these instruments in polar orbit.

6. Please discuss how the ocean data will improve weather forecasts for both NWS and Defense projects (e.g., in Fleet Numerical Products). How will TIROS complement present polar orbiter data and future GOES VAS data. What other benefits will NOSS provide?

7. How will NOSS complement or supercede the present ocean observing system of ships, buoys and met sats.

8. What satellite data, if any, is presently used in ocean routing schemes. What information and private sector service used presently?